UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,520	10/31/2003	Jonathan D. Herbach	07844-622001	4224
21876 FISH & RICHA	7590 02/11/200 ARDSON P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. Box 1022	C MINI 55440 1000	COLIN, CARL G		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2436	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/699,520	HERBACH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
CARL COLIN	2436	

T	he MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the	e cover sheet with the correspondence address	
THE REPLY	FILED <u>20 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATI	ION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 Ine repart applicates In	ly was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same tion, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) tion in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with ap tinued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which place opeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Rec	es the
b) X The no e Exa MO	: period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Active period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Active period for reply expire later than SIX miner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY C NTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). In the may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the	ion, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is la X MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHI	N TWO
have been filed under 37 CFR set forth in (b) a	I is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three ry earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension tatutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or	on fee r (2) as
filing the	tice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with e Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension there of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the tin TS	eof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
3. ⊠ The pro (a) ⊠ T (b) □ T	oposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to hey raise new issues that would require further consideration hey raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	n and/or search (see NOTE below);	for
(d)	They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a correspond NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.	ding number of finally rejected claims.	TOP
5. 🔲 Applica	nendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See att ant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if s	·	,
non-allo	proposed of affielded claim(s) would be allowable it so pwable claim(s). poses of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🛛 will not	•	_
how the The sta Claim(s Claim(s Claim(s Claim(s	e new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below tus of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: a) allowed: b) objected to: rejected: 2.3.6-10.12-20.22.24-35.37-41 and 47-56. withdrawn from consideration:		
	OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
because was not	davit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or e applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient tearlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary	
entered	davit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>agood and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was reasons why it is necessary and was re</u>	all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provid	le a
	fidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the sta <u>OR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>	atus of the claims after entry is below or attached.	
(see c	equest for reconsideration has been considered but does NO continuation of 3 below).		se:
12.	he attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/0	08) Paper No(s)	
	IC	Carl Colin/	
		rimary Examiner, Art Unit 2436	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite the associated information being locally stored and comprising user-dependent association information describing a relationship between the distributed electronic document and the second document. The claims as amended will not be entered because they raise new issues that were not presently previously and that would require further consideration and/or search. Applicant argues that McGee does not disclose locally stored association information because the hash is received from the client. Examiner respectfully disagrees as Mc Gee discloses the hash values stored in the server (see column 5, lines 13-40 and column 7, lines 50-57). Regarding applicant's arguments concerning user identification information, the final rejection already addressed this argument and showed that the hash may comprise other data such as user-dependent association information. In addition, user-dependent association information is not necessarily equivalent to user identity as argued by applicant. In response to Applicant's arguments that the independent claims recite user locally stored association information identifying the second document. It is noted that none of the independent claimsrecite the user-dependent association information is to identify the second electronic document. For at least the reasons mentioned above and in the final rejection, the request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance.